

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 11 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a), as described in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. Claims 3-10 and 12-15 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including the base claim and any intervening claims, as described in paragraph 3 of the Office Action. Claims 1 and 16 are the only independent claims.

The specification has been amended to place the application in correct idiomatic English.

Attached hereto are replacement formal drawings for Figs. 5a through 5c and Figs. 17a through 17c. In the replacement formal drawings, “SpD” and “FpDr” have been changed to --SpS-- and --FpSr--, respectively, in Fig. 5b to correspond with the detailed description thereof. In item 13 of Fig. 6, “Opical Pickup” has been changed to --Optical Pickup--. Further, “SpD” and “FpD” have been changed to --SpS-- and --FpS--, respectively, in Fig. 17b to correspond to the detailed description thereof.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “a disc detection system operable to detect a media type of the optical disc.” Further, claim 1 has been amended to recite a reader operable to read recorded data, “which includes the data to be reproduced and the information related to the display format of the data to be reproduced, from a recording surface of the optical disc.” Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that an on-screen message font-resolution selector is operable to control an on-screen message generator to set a resolution of a font to a value “dependent on the media type of the optical disc and to scale the font by a value dependent on the display format of the data to be reproduced.”

Claim 16 has been amended to recite “detecting a media type of the optical disc.” Further, claim 16 has been amended to recite “reading recorded data, which includes information related to a display format of the data to be reproduced, from a surface of the optical disc.” Moreover, claim 16 has been amended to recite that setting a resolution of a character font is based on “the detected media type” and to further recite “scaling the character font by a value based on the display format.”

Claims 1-16 have additionally been amended to remove “means for” or “step of” language so the claims would not be construed under 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph. The remainder of the amendments to the claims are intended to generally place the claims in better U.S. form without narrowing the scope of the claims as originally presented.

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 16 are patentable over the applied prior art for the following reasons.

In accordance with the present invention, a resolution of the On Screen Display (OSD) font is set in accordance with a media type of the optical disc, and further that a scaling of the font is performed dependent on the display format of the display data. Each of these features is recited in amended claims 1 and 16, as discussed above.

The applied prior art, either single or in combination fails to disclose or suggest the above discussed features that are recited in amended claims 1 and 16.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action indicates that the admitted prior art “fails to specifically disclose the feature of controlling on-screen message in a manner to set a resolution of the font to a value appropriate for the display format indicated by the record data as specified in present claim 1.” Clearly then, the admitted prior art fails to disclose or suggest: on an onscreen font resolution selector optical to control said on-screen message generator to set a resolution of the font to a value dependent on the media type of the optical disc and to select the font by a value dependent on display format of the data to be reproduced, as recited in amended independent claim 1; or setting a resolution of the character font based on the detecting media type and scaling the character font by a value based on the display format, as recited in amended independent claim 16.

Masaru fails to disclose or suggest the shortcomings of the admitted prior art such that a combination of the teachings of the admitted prior art and Masaru would disclose or suggest that which is recited in amended independent claims 1 and 16.

Masaru discloses a system operable to switch the font of an OSD between a high resolution and a low resolution. Masaru performs the switching based only on program information housed in memory part 13. Masaru does not disclose or suggest setting a resolution of the OSD font based on a media type of the optical disc. Masaru additionally does not disclose or suggest then further scaling the OSD font based on a display format of the data. Accordingly, Masaru fails to disclose or suggest: an onscreen message font-resolution selector operable to control said on-screen message generator to set a resolution of the font to a value dependent on the media type of the optical disc then to scale the font by a value dependent on display format of the data to be reproduced, as recited in amended independent claim 1; or setting a resolution of the character font based on the detected media type and scaling the character font by a value based on the display format, as recited in amended independent claim 16.

Because neither the admitted prior art nor Masaru disclose or suggest the on-screen message font-resolution selector, as recited in amended independent claim 1; or setting a resolution, as recited

in amended independent claim 16, a combination of the teachings of the admitted prior art and Masaru additionally fails to disclose or suggest that which is recited in amended independent claims 1 and 16. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 16, and dependent claims 2-15, are patentable over the applied prior art.

Furthermore, in light of the differences between amended independent claims 1 and 16 and the applied prior art, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have been motivated to modify the teachings of the applied prior art to arrive at that which is recited in independent claims 1 and 16.

In light of the above discussion, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection of claims 1, 2, 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Having fully and completely responded to the Office Action, Applicants submit that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

Katsuyuki TAKEUCHI

By:



Thomas D. Robbins
Registration No. 43,369
Attorney for Applicant

TDR/jlg/ksh
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
October 8, 2004

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED
TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE
FEES FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT
ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975